

established the Estonian Republic. History shows that this independence lasted little more than two decades, but the power and the example of Estonian courage will be felt always.

For hundreds of years the people of Estonia lived as subjects of other nations, yet never lost their faith in freedom or their desire for liberty. Their dream of freedom was a reality for only two decades. The Soviet Union shattered their dream and sought to eliminate them as a nation. With it all, the Estonian people have not given up their goal of liberty and national independence.

I join with others who share in the prayers of all Estonians that there will one day be a realization of this centuries-old hope: That freedom will return to that people whom we all respect and salute.

THE CHESSMAN CASE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I believe it might be well to forget the Chessman case. However, there appeared this morning in the Washington Post a very excellent article on that matter. The article was written by Roscoe Drummond, and it reads, in part, as follows:

CHESSMAN CASE: STATE DEPARTMENT WAS TALENT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

In the Caryl Chessman reprieve it seems to me that the State Department is being attacked for all the wrong reasons and is escaping criticism where it has been seriously at fault.

No blame attached to Roy E. Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, for transmitting objective information to Governor Brown, of California, that the execution of Chessman might subject President Eisenhower to dangerous, hostile demonstration during his South American trip.

Surely there was nothing wrong in passing along this information. If you were Governor, you would want to have all the facts bearing on your decision.

What is wrong and what is inexplicable is that the State Department should either be so tardily aware of emotional outbursts in numerous of the South American countries over the Chessman case or so dilatory in getting the facts to Governor Brown as to make it look as though foreign opinion was the deciding factor in its action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Record, because I believe it sets forth pertinent facts which the country should know.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHESSMAN CASE: STATE DEPARTMENT WAS TALENT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

In the Caryl Chessman reprieve it seems to me that the State Department is being attacked for all the wrong reasons and is escaping criticism where it has been seriously at fault.

No blame attached to Roy E. Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, for transmitting objective information to Governor Brown, of California, that the execution of Chessman might subject President Eisenhower to dangerous, hostile demonstration during his South American trip.

Surely there was nothing wrong in passing along this information. If you were Governor you would want to have all the facts bearing on your decision.

What is wrong and what is inexplicable is that the State Department should either be so tardily aware of emotional outbursts in numerous of the South American countries over the Chessman case or so dilatory in getting the facts to Governor Brown as to make it look as though foreign opinion was the deciding factor in his action.

The State Department ought to be excoriated on the first criticism and held to account for the second.

Several Senators leaped to the headlines the second they heard that Secretary Rubottom had transmitted to Governor Brown the Uruguayan Government's concern that the recent sentiment over Chessman's execution would get out of hand during Mr. Eisenhower's tour.

But what would they be saying if the President's life had been endangered, the whole good-will trip ruined and Secretary Rubottom had been found holding on his desk a telegram to Spangano he had refused to send? You can well imagine what they would be saying under such circumstances. Mr. Rubottom would be twice as vociferously denounced for not sending the telegram as he is now being upbraided for sending it.

These critics of the State Department's action are wrong at all other points. Secretary Rubottom did not intervene with any opinion as to what the State of California should do. He did no more than transmit pertinent information without recommendation. Actually, California's Deputy Attorney General, Richard F. Hogan, had telephoned Washington earlier asking for just this kind of information.

Secondly, it is inaccurate to suggest, as many have, that foreign sentiment in the Chessman case was a deciding factor in the reprieve. Governor Brown said no such thing. In announcing the reprieve, he said: "I do this because I want to give the people of California an opportunity through the legislature to express themselves more on capital punishment." At the end of his statement he mentioned the State Department's telegram as an additional factor.

The State Department seems to me to be blameless for its action. But I cannot escape the conviction that it is blameless for its long period of inaction which meant that in the end, communicating its information to California only a few hours before Chessman was due to die, it created by its own history, reporting the appearance of Governor Brown at the last minute.

The State Department has not excused its duty. It just did not discharge its duty soon enough and well enough.

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS TO WOMEN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the year 1960 promises to be a most eventful and fateful one—a year of critical decisions that will have a profound influence on the position of the free world and its ability to respond to the Soviet challenge; 1960 is also a year in which the American people will make an important decision for the future—whether or not we will return a Democratic President to the White House. It is no secret that I firmly believe that only the Democratic Party is equipped to lead our country through this crisis.

The challenge to our country and to the Democratic Party was discussed recently by the Honorable Hale Boggs in an eloquent address to the Women's Na-

tional Democratic Club, which, in my judgment, should stir the conscience of all true Americans. Hale Boggs is an outstanding leader in the House of Representatives. He is a vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Young in years, yet with considerable experience as an able and dedicated Congressman, he speaks with a clear, fresh voice.

His cogent and incisive address—which can be considered a clarion call to the Democratic Party—will explain, in part, why this dynamic legislator has achieved the national prominence he enjoys, and why the future holds so much in store for him as a national figure and as a leader of the Democratic Party. His excellent remarks on that occasion deserve the attention of all those who are vitally concerned with the survival of the purpose of our great Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this address by the Honorable Hale Boggs printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, WOMEN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 11, 1960

With the birthdays of both Washington and Lincoln, February is the month of the year that occasions more concentrated political speech-making than any other and this is particularly true in a presidential election year. Much as we should pay homage to these great Americans, it seems to me that we politicians have been neglecting another date on the calendar of this abbreviated month—a date whose political importance has not as yet been adequately assessed. I am speaking of St. Valentine's Day.

Political pollsters and prognosticators have devised all kinds of complicated techniques for forecasting the outcome of presidential elections. They do not neglect the most dazzling mathematical gymnastics. In the manner of St. Valentine's Day, in the early hours after the 1948 election, they divide southern California by northern Michigan and come out with a lousy victory in Rhode Island.

All this I say to tell you and misdirected theorizing. There is one fact about presidential election years that we politicians have not taken adequate cognizance of and to our peril. That is, simply, that every presidential year is a leap year. And, as everyone knows, in a leap year the ladies do the choosing. So on behalf of the Democratic Party I say in this month of February to you, the Women's National Democratic Club, "Will you be our Valentines?" And since I suspect that the answer will be in the affirmative, may I then express the hope that our partisan romance will flourish and that you will woo and win your Democratic man in this leap year of 1960.

I want to talk today about a subject that matters at this end of the time, the issue of the survival of Western civilization and, in my judgment, the issue which will test the fiber and decide the fortunes of the Democratic Party in the United States. This, of course, is the challenge of Soviet communism and the adequacy of our response to it. Seen against the perspective of history, it seems to me that the American people have a most fateful lot of decisions to make today and in the near future. It is no exaggeration to suggest that in a sense that is unique and unusual in our history, we hold the key to the kind of life that we